

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1-9, 11-14 and 17 have been amended and new claims 18-20 have been added by way of the present amendment. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action claims 1, 6, 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph; claims 1, 2, 6, 9-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,689,547 (Molne); claim 3-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molne in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,923,736 (Schachar); and claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molne in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,133,846 (Ginter). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 6-9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6-9 and 13 have been amended to clarify the invention. In particular, claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 have been amended to provide the required antecedent basis, as indicated in the outstanding Office Action. In addition, claims 7 and 8 have been amended to remove the phrases related to the term “such as” that renders the claims indefinite. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims of the application are now definite and it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated Molne. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1- 9, 11-14 and 17 have been amended to clarify the invention. In particular, each of the independent claims have been amended to include the limitations of: “Internet address,” “e-mail server,” and “web server” in order to patentably distinguish over Molne. Support for the amendments is provided in the original specification at least at page 4, lines 3-4; and page 6, lines 11-13; and shown at least in original **FIG. 13** and **FIG. 14** of the application. Therefore, the amendments raise no question of new matter.

Molne discloses a method of storing directory information in a cellular radiotelephone.¹ In particular, Molne discloses a cellular system that is provided with a network directory database **50** that includes a plurality of telephone number. Further, Molne discloses the network directory database **50** can include a plurality of search terms, wherein each of the telephone number is associated with one or more respective search terms that can include first names, last names, middle names, initials and addresses. Furthermore, Molne discloses the telephone numbers or numbers identified in the search are returned to the radiotelephone.

However, Molne nowhere discloses, as each of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13 and 14 recite, the particular limitations of “Internet address,” “e-mail server,” and “web server.” In fact, a word search of Molne reveals none of the above terms. Moreover, new claims 18-20 recite additional limitations including the terms “Simple Mail Transfer Protocol,” and “URL” which are not disclosed by Molne. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Molne does not disclose, anticipate or inherently teach the claimed invention and that claims 1-20 patentably distinguish thereover.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molne in view of Schachar. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

¹ Molne at ABSTRACT.

Claims 3-5 and 7-8 dependent upon claims 1 and 6, respectively. As discussed above, Molne does not disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 6. At least for those reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Molne also does not disclose the limitations of claims 3-5 and 7-8.

In addition, the outstanding Office Action acknowledges other deficiencies of Molne and attempts to overcome those deficiencies by combining Shachar with Molne. However, Shachar cannot overcome all of the deficiencies of Molne, as discussed below.

Shachar discloses a hypertext markup language interpreter resident within a telephone/terminal device that provides the basis of a hypertext based graphical user interface (GUI).² In particular, Shachar discloses a connect manager function **216** determines whether a hypertext page address is resident or remote (i.e., on the network) and provides access provider information **218** in the form of phone number, access procedures, log-on passwords, etc., as required for accessing a data communications network.³

However, Shachar nowhere discloses, as each of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13 and 14 recite, the particular limitations of the terms “e-mail server,” and “web server.” In fact, a word search of Shachar reveals neither of the above terms. Moreover, new claims 18-20 are further dependent on the above-reference claims and thus include additional limitations over those above-discussed. Thus, Shachar cannot overcome all of the deficiencies of Molne. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Molne nor Shachar, whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, suggest or make obvious the claimed invention and that claims 1-20 patentably distinguish thereover.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molne in view of Ginter. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

² Sachar at ABSTRACT, lines 5-10.

³ *Id.* at column 10, lines 46-51.

Claims 16 is dependent upon claim 14. As discussed above, Molne does not disclose the limitations of claim 14. Thus, at least for those reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Molne also does not disclose the limitations of claims 16.

In addition, the outstanding Office Action acknowledges other deficiencies of Molne and attempts to overcome those deficiencies by combining Ginter with Molne. However, Ginter cannot overcome all of the deficiencies of Molne, as discussed below.

Ginter discloses an integrated, modular array of administrative and support services for electronic commerce and electronic rights and transaction management.⁴ In particular, Ginter discloses an example architecture for a certifying authority 500 may include a secure communications facility **544**, an encryption/decryption processor **546**, a billing system **548**, a key generator **550**, a query mechanism **552**, and an electronic archive **554**.⁵

However, Ginter et al. nowhere discloses, as independent 14 recites, the particular limitations of the terms “e-mail server,” and “Internet address.” In fact, a word search of Ginter et al. reveals neither of the above terms. Thus, Ginter et al. cannot overcome all of the deficiencies of Molne. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Molne nor Ginter et al., whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, suggest or make obvious the claimed invention and that claims 16 patentably distinguish thereover.

Conclusion

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-00352-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: November 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Myron Keith Wyche/
Myron Keith Wyche
Registration No.: 47,341
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111 (Tel)
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Agent for Applicant

⁴ Ginter et al. at ABSTRACT.

⁵ *Id.* at **FIG. 48**;